arXiv:1301.2735v1 [math.DG] 12 Jan 2013

SMOOTHNESS OF ISOMETRIC FLOWS ON ORBIT SPACES AND MOLINO'S CONJECTURE

MARCOS M. ALEXANDRINO AND MARCO RADESCHI

Abstract. A map between the orbit spaces of two isometric actions on Riemannian manifolds is called smooth if the pull-back by this map sends smooth basic functions into smooth basic functions. In this paper we investigate the smoothness of isometric flows on orbit spaces. As an application we prove that the closure of the leaves of an orbit-like foliation is a singular Riemannian foliation. In other words, we solve the Molino's conjecture for orbit-like foliations, i.e. singular Riemannian foliation whose restriction to each slice is diffeomorphic to a homogenous foliation.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Blow-up along minimal stratum and lift of isometric flows 5
3. Isometric flows on orbit spaces: proof of Theorem 1.4 10
4. Molino's conjeture: proof of Theorem 1.7 18
Appendix A. Linearized vector fields and orbit-like foliations 20
References 24

1. Introduction

In this section, we recall some definitions and state our main results in Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.7.

Definition 1.1 (SRF)**.** A partition $\mathcal{F}$ of a complete Riemannian manifold M by connected immersed submanifolds (the *leaves*) is called a *singular Riemannian foliation* (SRF for short) if it satisfies condition (1) and (2):

(a) $\mathcal{F}$ is a *singular foliation*, i.e. for each leaf L and each $v \in TL$ with footpoint p, there is a smooth vector field $\vec{Y}$ with $\vec{Y}(p) = v$ that belongs to $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{F})$, i.e. that is tangent at each point to the corresponding leaf.

(b) $\mathcal{F}$ is a *transnormal system*, i.e. every geodesic perpendicular to one leaf is perpendicular to every leaf it meets.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 53C12, Secondary 57R30.

Key words and phrases. Singular Riemannian foliations, Myers-Steenrod theorem, isometric flow on orbit spaces, Molino's conjecture.

The first author was supported by CNPq and partially supported by FAPESP. The second author was partially supported by Benjamin Franklin Fellowship.

A leaf L of $\mathcal{F}$ (and each point in L) is called *regular* if the dimension of L is maximal, otherwise L is called *singular*. In addition a regular leaf is called *principal* if it has trivial holonomy; for a definition of holonomy, see e.g. [13, page 22].

A typical example of a singular Riemannian foliation is the partition of a Riemannian manifold into the connected components of the orbits of an isometric action. In this case the principal leaves coincide with the principal orbits.

Also recall that the restriction of $\mathcal{F}$ to a slice S_p is diffeomorphic to a SRF $\mathcal{F}_p$ on the normal space $\nu_p L_p = T_p S_p$ with respect to the flat metric g_p; see [13, 7]. This foliation $\mathcal{F}_p$ is called *infinitesimal foliation* at p.

On one hand, recent techniques in the theory of SRF shed light on some questions about isometric actions; see e.g. [11] or [3]. On the other hand, the theory of isometric actions feeds the theory of SRF with examples and motivates new questions. Furthermore, as stressed in the book of Gromoll and Walschap [10], " in the last decades there has been increasing realization that these foliations play a key role in understanding the structure of Riemannian manifolds, particularly those with positive or nonnegative sectional curvature". An example of this is the recent proof of the smoothness of the metric projection onto the soul, where Wilking use dualization of SRF [18]. Last, but not least, the quotient space of SRF or isometric actions provide examples of natural metric spaces with smooth structure as we now recall.

Let us consider a SRF $(M, \mathcal{F})$ with closed leaves. The quotient $M/\mathcal{F}$ is equipped with the natural quotient metric and a natural quotient "C^k structure". The C^k *structure* on $M/\mathcal{F}$ is given by the sheaf $C^k_b(M, \mathcal{F})$ of C^k *basic functions* on M, i.e. those functions that are constant along the leaves of $\mathcal{F}$. One says that a map $\varphi : M_1/\mathcal{F}_1 \to M_2/\mathcal{F}_2$ between two leaf spaces of SRF is of class C^k if the pull-back by φ sends smooth functions on $M_2/\mathcal{F}_2$ to functions on $M_1/\mathcal{F}_1$ of class C^k. When φ is smooth, this definition coincides with the definition of Schwarz [15].

As pointed out in [5], it is natural to ask whether an isometry between two orbit spaces, or more general an isometry between the leaf spaces of SRF, is smooth. In other words, if a version of Myers-Steenrod theorem is still valid for quotient spaces. This question was considered in [6].

In this paper we continue our study of isometries on quotient spaces. Our first result concerns the smoothness of flows of isometries on orbit spaces.

Definition 1.2. Consider a SRF $\mathcal{F}$ on a complete Riemannian manifold M with closed leaves. A continuous map $\varphi : M/\mathcal{F} \times I \to M/\mathcal{F}$ is called *a flow on* $M/\mathcal{F}$ if the following conditions hold:

(a) φ is a one-parameter local group;
(b) for each $p \in M/\mathcal{F}$ each integral curve $t \to \varphi(p, t)$ is contained in the quotient of a stratum;
(c) there exists a locally bounded derivative $\bar{Y}$ on $M/\mathcal{F}$ (i.e. $\bar{Y}$ is a derivation of $C^k_b(M, \mathcal{F})$) associated to the flow, such that for each smooth basic function h we have $\bar{Y} \cdot h(p) = \frac{d}{dt} h(\varphi(p, t))|_{t=0}$.

Remark 1.3. In the particular case where φ is a one-parameter local group of isometries of $M/\mathcal{F}$, one can prove that (a) implies (b) (see e.g., [9, section 5.1]) and that (a) and (b) imply (c) (see e.g. the proof of Lemma 2.4).

Theorem 1.4. *Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold and $\mathcal{F}$ be a singular Riemannian foliation. Assume that the leaves of $\mathcal{F}$ are orbits of a proper action*

$K \times M \to M$. Let $\varphi : M/K \times I \to M/K$ be a flow of isometries on the orbit space. Then φ is smooth.

This theorem allow us to prove Molino's conjecture for the class of orbit-like foliations.

Definition 1.5. A SRF $\mathcal{F}$ on M is called *orbit-like foliation* if for each point q there exits a compact group G_q of isometries of $\nu_q L_q$ such that the infinitesimal foliation $\mathcal{F}_q$ is the partition of $\nu_q L_q$ into the orbits of the action of G_q.

Apart from the partition of M into orbits of an isometric action, typical examples of orbit-like foliation can be constructed by suspension of homomorphism.

Example 1.6. Consider a manifold Q and let V be Riemannian manifolds with a SRF $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}_0}$ that is the partition of V into orbits of an a group of isometries K. Consider a homomorphism $\rho : \pi_1(Q, q_0) \to H \subset \mathrm{Iso}(V)$. Here H must act on V preserving the foliation $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}_0}$, i.e. it sends leaves to leaves. For example, V can be a product $V_1 \times V_2$ where each leaf $L_{(x,y)}$ is contained in $V_1 \times \{y\}$ and $K \subset \mathrm{Iso}(V_1)$. The group H can be chosen as a subgroup of $\mathrm{Iso}(V_2)$ acting on V as $h \cdot (x, y) = (x, h(y))$. Let $\widetilde{P} : \widetilde{Q} \to Q$ be the projection of the universal cover of Q. Then there is an action of $\pi_1(Q, q_0)$ on $\widetilde{M} = \widetilde{Q} \times V$ given by

$$(\widetilde{q}, v) \cdot [\alpha] = (\widetilde{q} \cdot [\alpha], \rho(\alpha^{-1}) \cdot v),$$

where $\widetilde{q} \cdot [\alpha]$ denotes the deck transformation associated to $[\alpha]$ applied to a point $\widetilde{q} \in \widetilde{Q}$. We denote by M the set of orbits of this action, and by $\Pi : \widetilde{M} \to M$ the canonical projection. It is possible to prove that M is a manifold. Define a map $\mathcal{P}$ by

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathcal{P} : M & \longrightarrow & Q \\ \Pi(\widetilde{q}, v) & \longmapsto & \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(\widetilde{q}). \end{array}$$

It follows that M is the total space of a fiber bundle, and $\mathcal{P}$ is its projection over the base space Q. In addition, the fiber is V and the structural group is given by the image of ρ. Finally, set $\mathcal{F} = \Pi(\widetilde{Q} \times \widetilde{\mathcal{F}_0})$.

Theorem 1.7. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be an orbit-like foliation on a complete Riemannian manifold M. Then the closure of the leaves of $\mathcal{F}$ is a SRF.*

Remark 1.8. In [13] Molino proved that, if M is compact, the closure of the leaves of a (regular) Riemannian foliation form a partition of M which is a singular Riemannian foliation. He also proved that the leaf closures are orbits of a locally constant sheaf of germs of (transversal) Killing fields. If the foliation is a SRF and M is compact, then Molino proved (see [13] Theorem 6.2 page 214) that the closure of the leaves is a transnormal system, but as he remarked it remains to be proven that the closure of the leaves is in fact a singular foliation. This question is known as Molino's conjecture. Molino's conjecture was proved for the case of polar foliations in [1] and for infinitesimal polar foliations in [5, 4].

So far the most well known examples of SRF's are

- closure of regular foliations,
- homogeneous and orbit-like foliations,
- polar and infinitesimally polar foliations.

Moreover, other foliations can be formed from these ones, that for the sake of clarity we will refer to as *pure foliations*, by taking products, suspensions of homomorphism, spherical joins, surgery etc.

Our theorem conclude the proof of Molinos conjecture to the pure foliations. This leads us to the following interesting questions:

(1) Is there an infinitesimal foliation on Euclidean space that is not a product of pure foliations?
(2) Can Molino Conjecture be proved for all the foliations generated by pure ones? In this case, one should be more precise about the exact meaning of "generate".

Along this paper, in order to prove the main results, we have to consider special cases of other interesting questions:

(3) Let $\rho : (\widehat{M}, \widehat{\mathcal{F}}) \to (M, \mathcal{F})$ be the desingularization of the SRF $\mathcal{F}$ (see Definition in Section 2) and let f be a basic function of $(M, \mathcal{F})$ that is smooth on the principal part of M. Under what conditions does the smoothness of the pull back function $\rho^* f$ imply the differentiability of f on M?
(4) Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a transverse operator defined on the principal part of M and let f be a smooth basic function on M. Under what conditions is $\mathcal{E}(f)$ a well defined smooth basic smooth function on M?

As we will discuss in the proof of Theorem 1.7, each closed pseudogroup G of isometries of $M/\mathcal{F}$ can be lifted to a closed Lie pseudogroup of isometries of an orbifold and hence, according to Salem [13, Appendix D], admits a Lie pseudogroup structure. Therefore Theorem 1.4 and the discussion in the proof of Theorem 1.7 imply the next corollary.

Corollary 1.9. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a closed orbit-like foliation on a complete Riemannian manifold M and G be a closed pseudogroups of isometries of $M/\mathcal{F}$. Then the Lie pseudogroup G acts smoothly on $M/\mathcal{F}$.*

The above corollary leads us to our last question.

(5) Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a closed SRF on a complete Riemannian manifold M and G a closed pseudogroup of isometries of $M/\mathcal{F}$. Under which conditions is the action of G on $M/\mathcal{F}$ smooth?

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we review the desingularization of SRF and discuss how one can lift isometric flows on a leaf space to isometric flows on the leaf space of a SRF with less singularities. In Section 3 we prove Theorem 1.4. The main ingredients of this proof are a result of Schwarz [15], some ideas of [6] and the regularity theory of solutions of linear parabolic equations. This regularity theory will demand some compatibility conditions that will be checked using the results presented in Section 2. Finally in Section 4 we prove Theorem 1.7 using Theorem 1.4 and results presented in Section 2.

In Appendix A we review the concept of linearized vector fields and discuss some of theirs properties. Roughly speaking the linearization of the infinitesimal foliation $\mathcal{F}_p$ provides the Riemannian homogenous part of $\mathcal{F}_p$. Therefore a locally closed SRF $\mathcal{F}$ is orbit-like if and only if the infinitesimal foliation is linearizable. Using linearized vector fields we also point out the existence of smooth vector fields of $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{F})$ that are invariant by homothetic transformation and the fact that tangent spaces of slices of the same leaf are isometric.

Acknowledgments. The authors are very grateful to Prof. Alexander Lytchack for his insightful comments and suggestions. The authors also thank Prof. Gudlaugur Thorbergsson and Prof. Burkhard Wilking for their supports.

2. Blow-up along minimal stratum and lift of isometric flows

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a SRF with closed leaves on a complete Riemannian manifold M. Like in the classical theory of isometric actions, by a composition of projective blow-up's along the strata it is possible to construct a surjective map $\rho_\epsilon : M_\epsilon \to M$ with the following properties: M_ϵ is a smooth complete Riemannian manifold foliated by a regular Riemannian foliation $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon$ and the map ρ_ϵ sends leaves of $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon$ to leaves of $\mathcal{F}$. This map is called a *desingularization map* and if $M/\mathcal{F}$ is compact, for each small $\epsilon > 0$ one can choose M_ϵ and ρ_ϵ so that $d_{GH}(M_\epsilon/\mathcal{F}_\epsilon, M/\mathcal{F}) < \epsilon$ where d_{GH} is the Gromov-Hausdorff distance; see [2].

In this section we briefly recall the construction of the first blow-up along the minimal stratum Σ (see [14, 2]) and present Lemma 2.4, Lemma 2.8 and Lemma 2.9 that will be used in the proof of the main theorems.

Following a procedure analogous to the blow-up of isometric actions one have the next lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $N := \mathrm{Tub}_r(\Sigma)$ be a small neighborhood of the minimal stratum Σ. Then*

(a) $\widehat{N} := \{(x, [\xi]) \in N \times \mathbb{P}(\nu\Sigma) | x = \exp^\perp(t\xi)$ for $|t| < r\}$ is a smooth manifold (called blow-up of N along Σ) and the projection or blow-up map $\hat{\rho} : \widehat{N} \to N$, defined as $\hat{\rho}(x, [\xi]) = x$ is also smooth.

(b) $\widehat{\Sigma} := \hat{\rho}^{-1}(\Sigma) = \{(\hat{\pi}([\xi]), [\xi]) \in \widehat{N}\} = \mathbb{P}(\nu\Sigma)$, where $\hat{\pi} : \mathbb{P}(\nu\Sigma) \to \Sigma$ is the canonical projection.

(c) There exists a singular foliation $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ on $\widehat{N}$ so that $\hat{\rho} : (\widehat{N} - \hat{\Sigma}, \hat{\mathcal{F}}) \to (N - \Sigma, \mathcal{F})$ is a foliated diffeomorphism. In addition if $\mathcal{F}$ is homogenous, i.e. the leaves are orbits of a proper action, then the leaves of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ are also homogenous.

A little more complicate is to get the right metric on $\widehat{N}$.

Lemma 2.2 ([2]). *There exists a metric $\hat{\mathrm{g}}$ on $\widehat{N}$ such that $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ is a SRF.*

Let us briefly recall the construction of this metric, that will be important in the proof of the results of this section.

Consider the smooth distribution $\mathcal{H}$ on N defined as $H_{\exp(\xi)} := T_{\exp(\xi)} S_q$ where $\xi \in \nu_q\Sigma$ and S_q is a slice of L_q at q with respect to the original metric g.

First we find a metric $\tilde{g}$ with the following properties:

(a) The distance between the leaves of $\mathcal{F}$ on N with respect to $\tilde{\mathrm{g}}$ and to respect to g are the same.

(b) The normal space of each plaque of $\mathcal{F}|_N$ (with respect to $\tilde{\mathrm{g}}$) is contained in $\mathcal{H}$. In fact those spaces are the orthogonal projection (with respect to g) of the normal spaces (with respect to g) of $\mathcal{F}|_N$.

(c) If a curve γ is a unit speed geodesic segment orthogonal to Σ with respect to the original metric g, then γ is a unit speed geodesic segment orthogonal to Σ with respect to the new metric $\tilde{\mathrm{g}}$.

We now come to the second step of our construction, in which we change the metric $\tilde{\mathrm{g}}$ in some directions, getting a new metric $\hat{\mathrm{g}}^M$ on $N - \Sigma$.

First note that, for small $\xi \in \nu_q\Sigma$, we can decompose $T_{\exp_q(\xi)}M$ as a direct sum of orthogonal subspaces (with respect to the metric $\tilde{g}$)

$$T_{\exp_q(\xi)}M = H^{\perp}_{\exp_q(\xi)} \oplus H^{1}_{\exp_q(\xi)} \oplus H^{2}_{\exp_q(\xi)} \oplus H^{3}_{\exp_q(\xi)}, \tag{2.1}$$

where $H^{\perp}_{\exp_q(\xi)}$ is orthogonal to $H_{\exp_q(\xi)}$ and $H^{i}_{\exp_q(\xi)} \subset H_{\exp_q(\xi)}$ is defined below.

1. $H^{1}_{\exp_q(\xi)}$ is the line generated by $\frac{d}{dt}\exp_q(t\xi)|_{t=1}$.
2. Set $N_q = \exp_q(\nu(\Sigma) \cap B_\epsilon(0))$. Then $H^{2}_{\exp_q(\xi)}$ is the orthogonal complement of $H^{1}_{\exp_q(\xi)}$ in $T_{\exp_q(\xi)}N_q$.
3. $H^{3}_{\exp_q(\xi)}$ is the orthogonal complement of $T_{\exp_q(\xi)}N_q$ in $H_{\exp_q(\xi)}$.

Now we define a new metric $\hat{\mathrm{g}}^M$ on $N - \Sigma$ as follows:

$$\hat{\mathrm{g}}^{N}_{\exp_q(\xi)}(Z,W) := \tilde{\mathrm{g}}(Z_\perp, W_\perp) + \tilde{\mathrm{g}}(Z_1, W_1) + \frac{r^2}{\|\xi\|^2}\tilde{\mathrm{g}}(Z_2, W_2) + \tilde{g}(Z_3, W_3), \tag{2.2}$$

where $Z_i, W_i \in H^{i}_{\exp_q(\xi)}$ and $Z_\perp, W_\perp \in H^{\perp}_{\exp_q(\xi)}$.

Finally we define the pullback metric $\hat{\mathrm{g}} := \hat{\rho}^{*}\hat{\mathrm{g}}^{N}$

We have recalled the construction of the blow-up an $\mathcal{F}$-invariant neigbhoorhood N along Σ. We have explained the case where $N = \mathrm{Tub}_r(\Sigma)$ because we will only be concerned with this kind of neighborhood N and with this first blow-up $\hat{\rho}$.

Remark 2.3. For the sake of completeness let us explain the rest of the construction, e.g. when M is compact. We simply glue $\widehat{N}$ with a copy of $M - N$ and construct the space $\widehat{M_r}(\Sigma)$ and the projection $\rho_r : \widehat{M_r}(\Sigma) \to M$. A natural singular foliation $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_r$ is induced on $\widehat{M_r}(\Sigma)$ in analogy to the blow-up of isometric actions. To define the appropriate metric $\widehat{\mathrm{g}}_r$ on $\widehat{M_r}(\Sigma)$ consider a partition of unity of $\widehat{M_r}(\Sigma)$ by two functions $\hat{f}$ and $\hat{h}$ such that

1. $\hat{f} = 1$ in $\mathrm{Tub}_{r/2}(\widehat{\Sigma})$ and $\hat{f} = 0$ outside of N.
2. $\hat{f}$ and $\hat{h}$ are constant on the cylinders $\partial\mathrm{Tub}_\delta(\widehat{\Sigma})$ for $\delta < 2r$.

Set $\hat{\mathrm{g}}_r := \hat{f}\hat{\mathrm{g}} + \hat{h}\mathrm{g}$ The desingularization ρ_ϵ mentioned in the introduction is then the composition of the blow-up's along the strata.

Lemma 2.4. *Each flow of isometries $\varphi : N/\mathcal{F} \times I \to N/\mathcal{F}$ can be lifted to a flow of isometries $\hat{\varphi} : \widehat{N}/\widehat{\mathcal{F}} \times I \to \widehat{N}/\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$.*

Proof. Since φ_t maps geodesics orthogonal to the minimal stratum to geodesics orthogonal to the minimal stratum, the lift $\hat{\varphi}_t$ is well defined and continuous.

Let x be a principal point and V the transverse space of the leaf L_x. Then V is decomposed into a direct sum of subspaces $V_1 \oplus V_2 \oplus V_3$, where $V_i = H_i \cap V$; for the definition of H_i recall equation (2.1). Let $\widehat{V}$ be the transversal space of $\widehat{L}_{\hat{x}}$ where $\hat{\rho}(\hat{x}) = x$. Then $\widehat{V}$ also decomposes into a direct sum $\widehat{V_j}$ and $d\hat{\rho} : (\widehat{V_j}, \hat{\mathrm{g}}_T) \to (V_j, g_j)$ is an isometry where $\hat{\mathrm{g}}_T$ is the transverse metric of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ and g_j is the restriction of transvere metric g_T of $\mathcal{F}$ to V_j, if $j \neq 2$ and $\mathrm{g}_2 = \frac{r^2}{\|\xi\|^2}\mathrm{g}_T$.

Note that φ_t (respectively $\hat{\varphi}_t$) preserves the decomposition V_i (respectively $\widehat{V_i}$). Since the function $\frac{r^2}{\|\xi\|^2}$ is invariant under the action of φ_t we infer that $\hat{\varphi}_t$ is a local isometry on $(\hat{\rho})^{-1}(N_0)/\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$, where N_0 is the union of principal leaves of N. Using the density of principal points in the quotient space $\widehat{N}/\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ and the fact that a minimal geodesic segment joining principal points does not contain singular points, we conclude that the each $\hat{\varphi}_t$ is a global isometry on $\widehat{N}/\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$.

In oder to check that the derivative $\bar{Y}$ is locally bounded one can proceed as follows. By successive blow-ups one can lift a continuous one parameter local group φ on $N/\mathcal{F}$ to an isometric flow on an orbifold (see Remark 2.6) where they are locally bounded by more classical results, see e.g. [13, Salem appendix D]. Since the blow-up's are distance non-increasing maps between the leaf spaces (see [2, Remark 3.8]) the result follows.

□

Although we will consider along the paper foliations $\mathcal{F}$ whose leaves are homogenous but not necessary Riemannian homogenous, we present the next result for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the partition of N into orbits of the action of a compact group G of isometries of N. Then there exists a new metric $\hat{\mathrm{g}}^G$ on $\widehat{N}$ so that $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ turns out to be Riemannian homogenous, i.e. a partition of $\widehat{N}$ into orbits of an isometric action of G on $\widehat{N}$ with the respect to the new metric $\hat{\mathrm{g}}^G$. The transverse metric associated to the new metric $\hat{\mathrm{g}}^G$ coincides with the transverse metric of the original metric $\hat{\mathrm{g}}$ of $\widehat{N}$.*

In particular a flow of isometries φ on the orbit space $N/\mathcal{F}$ can be lifted to a flow of isometries $\hat{\varphi}$ on the orbit space $\widehat{N}/\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ with respect to the new metric $\hat{\mathrm{g}}^G$.

Proof. We first claim that the action of G on each stratum preserves the normal bundle (with respect to $\tilde{\mathrm{g}}$) of each orbit in this stratum. In addition G acts isometrically on the fibers of this bundle.

The above claim is a direct consequence of the following facts:

(1) The distribution of $\mathcal{H}$ is invariant under the action of G.
(2) The normal bundle of the orbits (with respect to the original metric g) is invariant under the action of G.
(3) The orthogonal projection (with respect to the original metric g) is also invariant under the action of G.

Now, since the action preserves the decomposition V_1, V_2 and V_3 the claim is also valid for the metric $\hat{\mathrm{g}}^N$ and hence to the blow-up metric $\hat{\mathrm{g}} = \hat{\rho}^*\hat{\mathrm{g}}^N$. Finally one can define the new metric as

$$\hat{\mathrm{g}}^G(X,Y) := \int_G \hat{\mathrm{g}}(dgX, dgY)\omega$$

where ω is a right-invariant volume form of the compact group G. The rest of the proof follows from Lemma 2.4.

□

Remark 2.6. When M is compact, we can take into account Remark 2.3 and generalize the above results as follows:

(a) Each flow of isometries $\varphi : M/\mathcal{F} \times I \to M/\mathcal{F}$ can be lifted to a (smooth) flow of isometries $\varphi_\epsilon : M_\epsilon/\mathcal{F}_\epsilon \times I \to M_\epsilon/\mathcal{F}_\epsilon$.
(b) If $\mathcal{F}$ is the partition of M into orbits of a compact group G of isometries of M, then there exists a metric g_ϵ^G on M_ϵ so that $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon$ turns out to be the partition of M into orbits of an isometric action of G on M_ϵ. In addition

the transverse metric associated to this new metric g_ϵ^G coincides with the transverse metric of the original metric g_ϵ of M_ϵ.

2.1. **Blow-up functions.**

We conclude this section introducing a class of basic functions on N that will be used to check some compatibility conditions necessary to prove the regularity of solutions of a (weak) parabolic equation; see Lemma 3.7. Consider the blow-up $\hat{\rho} : (\widehat{N}, \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_N) \to (N, \mathcal{F}_N)$ of N along its minimal stratum D.

Definition 2.7. We say that a continuous $\mathcal{F}_N$-basic function h on N belongs to $\mathcal{B}$ or is a *blow-up function*, if

(a) $h \circ \hat{\rho}$ is a smooth $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$-basic function on $\widehat{N}$;
(b) the restriction of h to D and to $N - D$ is smooth;
(c) $\frac{d}{dt} h \circ \alpha(0) = 0$, for each geodesic α orthogonal to the singular stratum D and such that $\alpha(0)$ is a singular point.

In what follows we prove two important properties of these functions.

Lemma 2.8. *If $h \in \mathcal{B}$ then h is a C^1 function.*

Proof. Let q be a singular point. In order to prove the lemma, it suffices to show that

$$\vec{e}_j \cdot h(p_i) \to 0 \tag{2.3}$$

for each sequence $p_i \to q$ and for some frame $\{\vec{e}_j\}$ tangent to the distance spheres in the normal bundle of D. In fact, first consider a simple example, namely when $N = \mathbb{R}^2$ is foliated by concentric circles around the origin and $D = \{q\} = \{(0,0)\}$. In this case one must prove that $\nabla h(p_i) \to 0$. Note that $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}(p_i) = a_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial r}(p_i) + a_2 \vec{e}(p_i)$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}(p_i) = b_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial r}(p_i) + b_2 \vec{e}(p_i)$ where $|a_i|$ and $|b_i|$ are bounded. Equation (2.3) and item (c) of Definition 2.7 imply that $\nabla h(p_i) \to 0$. Finally in the general case where D has more than one point, we still only need to prove equation (2.3), because $\vec{\zeta}_j \cdot h(p_i) \to \vec{\zeta}_j \cdot h(q)$, where $\{\vec{\zeta}_j\}$ is a frame orthogonal to the leaves of $\mathcal{F}_N$ and orthogonal to the fibers $\{N_z\}$ cf., the proof of [2, Lemma 3.5].

Set $g := h \circ \hat{\rho}$ and let $\{\hat{p}_n\} \subset \widehat{N}$ be the lift of $\{p_n\}$. We can assume without loss of generality that $\{\hat{p}_n\}$ is contained in a relatively compact neighborhood that admits cylindrical coordinates (r, θ_i, z_i).

Define $\vec{e}_j \circ \hat{\rho} = \frac{1}{r} \hat{\rho}_* \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j}$. Also, let $\underline{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots \theta_{\mathrm{codim}(D,N)-1})$ and $\underline{z} = (z_1, \dots z_{\dim D})$.

By definition of $\vec{e}_j$, in order to prove equation (2.3) it suffices to show

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{r(n)} \frac{\partial g}{\partial \theta_i}(r(n), \underline{\theta}(n), \underline{z}(n)) = 0 \tag{2.4}$$

for the sequence $\hat{p}_n = (r(n), \underline{\theta}(n), \underline{z}(n))$ that converges to the fiber $(0, \underline{\theta}, \underline{z})$.

From the definition of g we have

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial \theta_i}(0, \underline{\theta}, \underline{z}) = 0 \tag{2.5}$$

Condition (c) implies

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial r}(0, \underline{\theta}, \underline{z}) = 0 \tag{2.6}$$

and hence, since g is smooth (see condition (a)), we conclude that

$$\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial r \partial \theta_i}(0,\underline{\theta},\underline{z}) = \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \theta_i \partial r}(0,\underline{\theta},\underline{z}) = 0 \tag{2.7}$$

From mean value theorem we also have

$$\Big|\frac{1}{r(n)}\frac{\partial g}{\partial \theta_i}(r(n),\underline{\theta}(n),\underline{z}(n)) - \frac{1}{r(n)}\frac{\partial g}{\partial \theta_i}(0,\underline{\theta}(n),\underline{z}(n))\Big| \leq \Big|\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial r \partial \theta_i}(\tilde{r}(n),\underline{\theta}(n),\underline{z}(n))\Big| \tag{2.8}$$

Now Eq. (2.4) follows direct from equations (2.5), (2.7) and (2.8).

□

Let φ be a flow of isometries on $N/\mathcal{F}_N$ and consider the flow of isometries $\hat{\varphi}$ on $\widehat{N}/\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_N$ defined in Lemma 2.4. Let $\bar{Y}$ be the associated derivative in the quotient $N/\mathcal{F}_N$; recall Definition 1.2.

Lemma 2.9. *Assume that $\hat{\varphi}$ is smooth. If $h \in \mathcal{B}$ then $\varphi_s^*(\bar{Y}\cdot h) \in \mathcal{B}$.*

Proof. We must check that the function $(\bar{Y}\cdot h)\circ\varphi_s$ satisfies the conditions of the Definition 2.7.

Condition (b) of Definition 2.7 follows from hypothesis.

Now we want to check condition (a) of Definition 2.7. Note that $\varphi_{t+s}\circ\hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho}\circ\hat{\varphi}_{t+s}$.

$$\begin{aligned}(\bar{Y}\cdot h)\circ\varphi_s\circ\hat{\rho}(\cdot) &= \frac{d}{dt}h(\varphi(\varphi(\hat{\rho}(\cdot),s),t))|_{t=0}\\ &= \frac{d}{dt}h(\varphi(\hat{\rho}(\cdot),s+t))|_{t=0}\\ &= \frac{d}{dt}h(\hat{\rho}(\hat{\varphi}_{s+t}(\cdot)))|_{t=0} \in C^\infty.\end{aligned}$$

Finally we have to check condition (c) of Definition 2.7. Let γ be a geodesic orthogonal to the minimal stratum D and $\hat{\gamma}\subset\widehat{N}$ a lift of γ. Consider the smooth function $g(k,t) := h\circ\hat{\rho}(\hat{\varphi}_{s+k}(\hat{\gamma}(t)))$. Note that $\hat{\varphi}_{k+s}\circ\hat{\gamma}$ is a horizontal geodesic orthogonal to the lift of D and hence that $\hat{\rho}\circ\hat{\varphi}_{k+s}\circ\hat{\gamma}$ is orthogonal to D. This fact and the fact that $h\in\mathcal{B}$ (in particular satisfies condition (c) of Definition 2.7) imply that $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}g(k,0)=0$. We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}(\bar{Y}\cdot h)\circ\varphi_s\circ\gamma(t))|_{t=0} &= \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t\partial k}h(\varphi_{s+k}(\gamma(t)))|_{k,t=0}\\ &= \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t\partial k}h(\hat{\rho}\circ\hat{\varphi}_{s+k}(\hat{\gamma}(t)))|_{k,t=0}\\ &= \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t\partial k}g(k,t)|_{k,t=0}\\ &= \frac{\partial^2}{\partial k\partial t}g(k,t)|_{k,t=0}\\ &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 2.10. As we prove Theorem 1.4, it will be clear that the hypothesis in Lemma 2.9, i.e. the smoothness of $\hat{\varphi}$, is always satisfied when $\mathcal{F}$ is homogeneous.

Remark 2.11. The above results are also valid for foliation with disconnected leaves; for definitions see the beginning of Section 3.

3. Isometric flows on orbit spaces: proof of Theorem 1.4

In order to avoid cumbersome notations, we will denote each basic function $h : M \to \mathbb{R}$ and the induced function on $M/\mathcal{F}$ by the same letter h.

We know that Theorem 1.4 is true when all orbits have the same dimension, see e.g. [13, Salem appendix D] and Swartz[17]. We assume by induction that Theorem 1.4 is true for a number of strata lower or equal to $n-1$.

Let q be a point of the minimal stratum Σ and $D \subset \Sigma$ a slice to the foliation $\mathcal{F}|_{\Sigma}$ that contains q. For each $p \in D$ we define $N_p := \exp_p(\nu_p\Sigma \cap B_\epsilon(0))$ and we set $N := \cup_{p\in D} N_p$. Finally consider $\mathcal{F}_N := \mathcal{F} \cap N$ the intersection of $\mathcal{F}$ with the manifold N.

It might happen that some leaf in $\mathcal{F}$ intersects N in more than one leaf of $\mathcal{F}_N$, and we want to take this into account. This is why we consider $\mathcal{F}_N$ as a *foliation with disconnected leaves*. In other words, along Section 3, we think of $\mathcal{F}_N$ as a triple $(N, \mathcal{F}^0_N, K)$ where $(N, \mathcal{F}^0_N)$ is a (usual) SRF, K is a group of isometries of $N/\mathcal{F}^0_N$, and the *non-connected leaves* of $\mathcal{F}_N$ are just the orbits $K \cdot L_p$, for $L_p \in \mathcal{F}^0_N$ (think for example to the orbit decomposition of a group action, by a disconnected Lie group).

Note that the restriction of the flow φ to the orbifold $\Sigma/\mathcal{F}_\Sigma$ is smooth. Therefore we can lift φ to a smooth flow on D; see [17]. Let Y be the integral curve of this flow starting at $q \in D$. Let $N|_Y$ denote restriction of the bundle $\mathsf{p}_N : N \to D$ to $Y \subseteq D$. Finally let X denote the fiber N_q of p_N.

Before we go through the details, let us briefly explain the main idea of the proof. We will prove that φ is smooth on $N/\mathcal{F}_N \times I$. In other words, for a given smooth $\mathcal{F}_N$-basic function h on N we will prove that $\varphi^* h$ is a smooth basic function on $N \times I$ with respect to the foliation $\mathcal{F}_N \times \{*\} = \{L_N \times \{*\}\}$. In fact we will prove something stronger, namely the existence of a smooth basic field $\vec{Y}$ on N whose flow projects to φ. Once we have showed this, the proof will be complete, since the basic vector field $\vec{Y}$ can be extended on a neighborhood of N in M using the composition of the flows of smooth vector fields tangent to the leaves of the singular stratum Σ; see item (a) of Definition 1.1. The proof that φ is smooth on $N/\mathcal{F}_N \times I$ will require three steps.

First we will prove in Proposition 3.4 that the restriction of $\varphi^* h$ to $X \times I$ is smooth where $X := N_q$. The main idea here is to use some some arguments of [6] to check that $u(x,t) := \varphi^* h(x,t)$ is a weak solution of a parabolic equation; see equation (3.3). Then we will apply regularity theory of solutions of linear parabolic equations to prove that u is smooth. This regularity theory requires some compatibility conditions that will be checked using Lemmas 2.8 and 2.9; see details in Lemma 3.7.

Then in Proposition 3.8 we will prove that the restriction of φ to $(N|_Y/\mathcal{F}_N) \times I$ is smooth, i.e. given a smooth function h on $N/\mathcal{F}_N$ we will prove that $\varphi^* h$ is smooth on $(N|_Y/\mathcal{F}_N) \times I$. Here we will apply Proposition 3.4, properties of the flow and Inverse Function Theorem on orbit space (see [15, page 45]).

Once we have proved in Proposition 3.8 that the restriction of φ to $(N|_Y/\mathcal{F}_N)\times I$ is smooth, it will follow from Schwarz [15, Corollary 2.4] that there exists a smooth basic field $\vec{Y}$ on the subbundle $N|_Y$ whose projection onto the quotient is the flow of φ.

Finally, we will prove in Proposition 3.9 that this vector field can be extended to a vector field defined on N whose projection onto the quotient is still the flow of φ and the proof will be concluded.

Before we start the proof of Proposition 3.4, let us make some considerations about the metrics on N, the structure of the fiber bundle $\mathsf{p}_N : N \to D$ and some properties about the subbundle $N|_Y$.

Lemma 3.1. *There exists a metric* $\tilde{\mathrm{g}}$ *on* N *that preserves transverse metric of* $\mathcal{F}$, *i.e. so that the leaves of* $\mathcal{F}^0_N$ *have the same distance as the plaques of* $\mathcal{F}$ *that contain such leaves. In particular* $\mathcal{F}^0_N$ *and* $\mathcal{F}_N$ *are SRF on* $(N,\tilde{\mathrm{g}})$.

Proof. This metric can be construced as follows. Consider the regular distribution $\mathcal{H}$ defined as $H_z := T_zS_p$ where $z \in N_p$. According to [2, Proposition 3.1] there exists a metric $\tilde{\mathrm{g}}$ on a neighborhood of N so that the normal space of $\mathcal{F}$ (with respect to $\tilde{\mathrm{g}}$) is contained in $\mathcal{H}$ and the SRF $\mathcal{F}$ (with respect to $\tilde{\mathrm{g}}$) has the same transverse metric of $\mathcal{F}$ (with respect to the original metric). Let $\Pi : TM \to TN$ be the orthogonal projection (with respect to original metric) and define a metric on TN as $(\Pi|_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1})^*\tilde{\mathrm{g}}$. Let us denote this new metric on N also as $\tilde{\mathrm{g}}$. Following [2, Proposition 2.17] we conclude that $\mathcal{F}^0_N$ is a SRF on $(N,\tilde{\mathrm{g}})$.

□

Let $\pi_{\mathcal{F}^0_N} : N \to N/\mathcal{F}^0_N$ be the quotient map and note that $\pi_{\mathcal{F}^0_N}(D)$ can be identified with D. Let $\mathsf{p}_{N/\mathcal{F}^0_N} : N/\mathcal{F}^0_N \to D$ be the submetry with fibers $N_p/\mathcal{F}^0_N$. Note that the diagram below commutes

$$\begin{tikzcd}
N \arrow[r, "\mathsf{p}_N"] \arrow[d, "\pi_{\mathcal{F}^0_N}"'] & D \\
N/\mathcal{F}^0_N \arrow[ur, "\mathsf{p}_{N/\mathcal{F}^0_N}"'] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

The equation below will allow us to prove the next lemma.

$$\mathsf{p}_N = \mathsf{p}_{N/\mathcal{F}^0_N} \circ \pi_{\mathcal{F}^0_N} \tag{3.1}$$

Lemma 3.2. *There exists a metric* g_N *on* N *with following properties:*

(a) The submersion $\mathsf{p}_N : N \to D$ *is Riemannian.*
(b) Each fiber N_p *is flat*
(c) The foliation $\mathcal{F}^0_N$ *is a SRF on* (N,g_N).

Proof. Consider the regular distribution $\mathcal{H}$ defined as $H_z := T_zS_p$ where $z \in N_p$ and the metric g_0 on $\mathcal{H}$ so that $\mathrm{d}(exp_p)_vT_vT_pS_p \to H_{\exp_p(v)}$ is an isometry, where v is normal to Σ. Let $\Pi : TM \to TN$ be the orthogonal projection (with respect to original metric) and define a metric on TN as $(\Pi|_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1})^*\mathrm{g}_0$. Let us denote this new metric on N also as g_0. Following [2, Proposition 2.17] we conclude that $\mathcal{F}^0_N$ is a SRF on (N,g_0). In particular, if N is identified with a neighborhood of $\nu_\Sigma|_D$, we have defined a metric on this neighborhood, so that $\nu_p\Sigma$ is flat. This follows from the fact that $T_xN_p \subset H_x$ and from the fact that $\mathrm{d}(exp_p)_v T_vT_pS_p \to H_{\exp_p(v)}$ is an isometry.

Now consider V_3 the distribution orthogonal to the fibers of N; recall V_3 defined in Lemma 2.4. We will change the metric of V_3 in order to get the appropriate metric g_N satisfying (a) and (c).

Set $V_3^{N/\mathcal{F}_N^0} := (\pi_{\mathcal{F}_N^0})_* V_3$ and consider the metric on $V_3^{N/\mathcal{F}_N^0}$ that makes the submersion $\mathsf{p}_{N/\mathcal{F}_N^0}$ Riemannian. Finally consider the metric on V_3 so that $(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_N^0})_* : V_3 \to V_3^{N/\mathcal{F}_N^0}$ turns out to be an isometry.

Equation (3.1) implies that p_N is a Riemannian submersion with respect to the new metric g_N. Since $V_3^{N/\mathcal{F}_N^0} = (\pi_{\mathcal{F}_N})_* V_3$ we also conclude that $\mathcal{L}_{\vec{X}}(\mathrm{g}_N)|_{V_3} = 0$ for each vector field $\vec{X}$ tangent to the leaves; here $\mathcal{L}_{\vec{X}}$ denotes the Lie derivative. This last fact and the fact that $\mathcal{F}_N^0$ is a SRF with respect to some metric (e.g., the metric $\tilde{g}$ constructed before) imply that $\mathcal{F}_N^0$ is SRF with respect to g_N; see similar argument in [2].

□

Unless explicitly stated otherwise, we will always consider the Riemannian metric g_N on N defined in Lemma 3.2.

Recall that the goal of this section is to prove Theorem 1.4. In particular, we are assuming that the leaves of $(M, \mathcal{F})$ are the orbits of a smooth action of a Lie group K on M.

Lemma 3.3 (The group G)**.** *The points of the curve Y have the same isotropy group $G := K_q$. Also note that the restriction of $\mathcal{F}_N$ to $N|_Y$ is the partition of $N|_Y$ into the orbits of the (isometric) action of G.*

Proof. Let us denote $\tilde{\varphi}_t$ the isometry on the slice D of q that is the lift of φ_t; see e.g. [17].

We first claim that $\tilde{\varphi}_t K_q \tilde{\varphi}_t^{-1} = K_{\tilde{\varphi}_t(q)}$. Let p be a principal point in the slice D and $k \in K_q$. Set $k_1 := \tilde{\varphi}_t k \tilde{\varphi}_t^{-1}$. Note that $k_1\tilde{\varphi}_t(p) = \tilde{\varphi}_t(kp)$. On the other hand, since φ_t is an isometry in the quotient and in particular sends loops into loops, we have that there exists $k_2 \in K_{\tilde{\varphi}_t(q)}$ such that $k_2\tilde{\varphi}_t(p) = \tilde{\varphi}_t(kp)$. Therefore, since p is a principal point we infer that $k_1 = k_2$ and hence $\tilde{\varphi}_t K_q \tilde{\varphi}_t^{-1} \subset K_{\tilde{\varphi}_t(q)}$. The proof of the other inclusion is identical and hence the claim has been proved.

Now, since D is a slice at q, we have that $K_{\tilde{\varphi}_t(q)}, K_q$ are compact Lie subgroups and $K_{\tilde{\varphi}_t(q)} \subset K_q$. These facts and the above claim imply that $K_{\tilde{\varphi}_t(q)} = K_q$.

In the particular case where $\mathcal{F}$ is Riemannian homogeneous, then the fact that G acts isometrically follows from the previous lemma.

□

We are finally ready to start our discussion about the smoothness of φ.

Proposition 3.4. *Let h be a smooth function on $N/\mathcal{F}_N$ then the restriction of $\varphi^* h$ to $X \times (-\epsilon, \epsilon)$ is smooth, where $X = N_q$.*

Proof. The proof of proposition 3.4 will require the lemmas below.

Consider the metric $\tilde{\mathrm{g}}$ on N that preserves the transverse metric of $\mathcal{F}$; see Lemma 3.1. Then φ is a flow of isometries on $(N, \tilde{\mathrm{g}})/\mathcal{F}_N$. This fact, the same argument in [6, Proposition 2.3] and item (c) of Definition 1.2 imply the next lemma.

Lemma 3.5. *The restriction of the flow φ to $N/\mathcal{F}_N \times (-\epsilon, \epsilon)$ is a C^1 map.*

Note that for each fixed t we have an isometry $\phi(t) : X/\mathcal{F}_N \to N_{\gamma(t)}/\mathcal{F}_N$ defined as $\phi(t)(x) := \varphi(x,t)$, c.f., [6]. Here γ denotes the integral curve at q that parametrizes Y.

Since X and $N_{\gamma(t)}$ are flat, it follows from [6, Proposition 2.1] that $\phi(t)$ preserves the mean curvature vector field. From [6, Lemma 2.5] the following equation holds in weak sense.

$$\triangle\, \phi(t)^* h = \phi(t)^* \triangle\, h. \tag{3.2}$$

where $\triangle h$ denotes the Laplacian operator with respect to $N_{\gamma(t)}$ applied to the restriction of h to $N_{\gamma(t)}$.

Set $u(\cdot,t) := \phi(t)^* h$. From Lemma 3.5 $\frac{d}{dt}u$ is continuous and we can define $f(\cdot,t) = \phi^*(t) \triangle h + \frac{d}{dt}u(\cdot,t)$. Then the above equation implies

$$\frac{d}{dt}u + \triangle u = f \tag{3.3}$$

in weak sense.

The equation above motivates us to consider the results of regularity of parabolic equations to prove that u is smooth. Let us recall the next result that can be found in Evans [8, Theorem 6, page 365]; for definitions and notations about Sobolev spaces see [8].

Lemma 3.6. *Assume that $g \in H^{2m+1}(X)$, $\frac{d^k f}{dt^k} \in L^2(0,T,H^{2m-2k}(X))$ $(k = 0,\ldots,m)$. Suppose also the following m^{th}-order compatibility condition holds:*

$$g_0 = g \in H^1_0(U), g_1 = f(0) - \triangle g_0 \in H^1_0(X)$$

$$\ldots, g_m = \frac{d^{m-1}f}{dt^{m-1}}(0) - \triangle g_{m-1} \in H^1_0(X)$$

Let $u \in L^2(0,T,H^1_0(X))$ with $\frac{du}{dt} \in L^2(0,T,H^{-1}(X))$ be a weak solution of

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}u + \triangle u &= f \text{ in } X_T \\ u &= 0 \text{ on } \partial X \times [0,T] \\ u &= g \text{ on } X \times \{t=0\} \end{aligned}$$

Then $\frac{d^k u}{dt^k} \in L^2(0,T,H^{2m+2-2k}(X))$.

The regularity theory of solutions of linear parabolic equations requires some compatibility conditions, that will be assured in the next lemma.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $h \in \mathcal{B}$ and set $u(\cdot,t) := \phi(t)^* h$. Then for $n \geq 0$ we have*

(a) $\frac{d^n u}{dt^n}(\cdot,t) \in C^\infty(X)$ *for each t.*
(b) $\frac{d^n u}{dt^n} \in L^2(0,T,H^1(X))$.

Proof. Let us prove the case where $n = 1$ the other cases are identical. Recall that we are assuming by induction that Theorem 1.4 is true for a number of strata lower or equal to $n-1$. Therefore we can assume that Lemma 2.9 holds, and $\hat{\varphi}$ is smooth. We also know that

$$\frac{du}{dt} = \varphi^*(\bar{Y} \cdot h)$$

The above equation, Lemma 2.8 and Lemma 2.9 imply that $\frac{du}{dt}(\cdot, t)$ is C^1 for each t. The above equation also implies that $\frac{du}{dt}$ is continuous.

Note that in the regular stratum

$$\triangle \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\phi^*(t)h = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \triangle \phi^*(t)h = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\phi^*(t) \triangle h$$

Since $\frac{du}{dt}(\cdot, t)$ is C^1 we can apply the same argument as in [6] to infer that the following equation holds weakly:

$$\triangle \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\phi^*(t)h = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\phi^*(t) \triangle h \tag{3.4}$$

From regularity theory of solutions of elliptic partial differential equations [8] we conclude that $\frac{du}{dt}(\cdot, t)$ is $H^3(X)$. Applying the argument successively we infer the smoothness of $\frac{du}{dt}(\cdot, t)$.

Now since $\bar{Y} \circ h \in \mathcal{B}$ and φ_{t_0} sends orthogonal geodesics to the minimal stratum to orthogonal geodesics to the minimal stratum we have that the directional derivatives of $\frac{du}{dt}$ exist. Then we have that

$$\|\nabla \frac{du}{dt}\| = \|\nabla \varphi^*(\bar{Y} \cdot h)\|.$$

The term on the right-hand side of this equation is a continuous function due to Lemma 3.5.

Finally the fact that $\frac{du}{dt}$ and $\|\nabla \frac{du}{dt}\|$ are continuous and item (a) imply item (b).

□

We claim that equation (3.3), Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.7 imply that the function u defined as $u(\cdot, t) = \phi(t)^*h$ is smooth and hence the proof of the proposition is complete. In what follows we explain this claim.

Note that $g_0(\cdot) = u(\cdot, 0) = h \in C^\infty$. Set $f(\cdot, t) := \phi^*(t) \triangle h + \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\phi^*(t)h$. From Lemma 3.7, equation (3.3) and Lemma 3.6 we conclude that $u \in L^2(0, T, H^2(X))$.

Now we want to apply Lemma 3.6 to check that

$$u \in L^2(0, T, H^4(X)). \tag{3.5}$$

In order to do this we must check the compatibility conditions. The first one to check is

$$f \in L^2(0, T, H^2(X)). \tag{3.6}$$

Replacing the smooth function h with the smooth function $\triangle h$ in the above discussion, we have that $\phi^* \triangle h \in L^2(0, T, H^2(X))$. Therefore to get equation (3.6) we need to prove that

$$u^1 := \frac{d}{dt}u \in L^2(0, T, H^2(X)). \tag{3.7}$$

Note that Lemma 3.7 implies:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\phi^*(t) \triangle h + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2}\phi^*(t)h =: f^1(\cdot, t) \in C^1 \text{ and } f^1 \in L^2(0, T, H^1(X)). \tag{3.8}$$

As discussed in the proof of Lemma 3.7 and we have the weak equation:

$$\triangle \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\phi^{*}(t)h = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\phi^{*}(t) \triangle h \tag{3.9}$$

and hence

$$\frac{d}{dt}u^{1} + \triangle u^{1} = f^{1}$$

in weak sense. Now we can apply Lemma 3.6 ($m = 0$) and infer equation (3.7) and hence equation (3.6).

We have already proved in (3.8) that $\frac{d}{dt}f = f^{1} \in L^{2}(0, T, H^{1}(X))$. We know from Lemma 3.7 $g_0, g_1 \in C^{\infty}$. These facts and equation (3.6) allow us to apply Lemma 3.6 and to infer the desired equation (3.5).

Now one can apply the same procedure to prove that

$$u \in L^{2}(0, T, H^{n}(X)) \tag{3.10}$$

Here one has to apply Lemma 3.6 ($m < n$) for $u^{k} := \frac{d^{k}}{dt^{k}}u$ and $f^{k} = \frac{d^{k}}{dt^{k}}f$.

Finally equation (3.10) for all n implies that u is smooth as usual.

□

Proposition 3.8. *The restriction of φ to $(N|_{Y}/\mathcal{F}_N) \times I$ is smooth.*

Proof. If Y is a point, then the result was already proved in the previous proposition. Let us assume that Y is not a point.

We know from Proposition 3.4 that ψ, i.e., the restriction of φ to $N_q/\mathcal{F}_N \times I$, is smooth and therefore we can apply Inverse Function Theorem on orbit space (see [15, page 45]) to conclude that ψ^{-1} is smooth. Note that, since for each fixed s the function $\mathsf{p}_{N/\mathcal{F}_N} \circ \psi(\cdot, s)$ is a constant $k(s)$, it is not necessarly to reduce N_q in order to define ψ^{-1}. We claim that the diagram below commutes, and hence φ is a composition of smooth maps and therefore is a smooth map.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
N|_{Y}/\mathcal{F}_N \times I \arrow[r, "\varphi"] \arrow[d, "\psi^{-1}\times \mathrm{Id}"'] & N|_{Y}/\mathcal{F}_N \arrow[d, "\psi^{-1}"] \\
(X/\mathcal{F}_N \times I) \times I \arrow[r, "(\mathsf{p}_1, \mathsf{p}_2+\mathsf{p}_3)"'] & (X/\mathcal{F}_N \times I)
\end{tikzcd}$$

In fact, set $z = \psi(\tilde{x}, s)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(z,t) &= \varphi_t(z) \\
&= \varphi_t(\psi(\tilde{x}, s)) \\
&= \varphi(\tilde{x}, s + t) \\
&= \psi(\mathsf{p}_1 \circ \psi^{-1}(z), \mathsf{p}_2 \circ \psi^{-1}(z) + t).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Finally the smoothness of φ on $N/\mathcal{F}_N \times I$ will follow from the proposition below.

Proposition 3.9. *There exists a smooth basic vector field $\vec{Y}$ on N whose flow projects to φ.*

Proof. As we have seen in Proposition 3.8 φ restricted to $N|_Y/\mathcal{F}_N \times I$ is smooth. Therefore by Schwarz [15, Corollary 2.4] there exists a smooth basic field $\vec{Y}$ on the subbundle $N|_Y$ whose projection onto the quotient is the flow of φ. In what follows we will extend this vector field to a vector field defined on N whose projection onto the quotient is still the flow of φ.

Let $\vec{\xi}$ be an equivariant vector field normal to Y, defined along the orbit $Y \subset D$, i.e., $\vec{\xi}(z) \in T_zD \cap (T_zY)^{\perp}$. This vector field can be extended to be a normal vector field of $N|_Y$ so that the restriction of $\vec{\xi}$ to each fiber of $N|_Y$ is a basic vector of the submersion $\mathsf{p}_N : N \to D$.

Lemma 3.10. *$\vec{\xi}$ is a foliated vector field of $\mathcal{F}_N^0$ and for each fixed x the geodesic $t \to \exp_x(t\vec{\xi}(x))$ is always contained in the same stratum.*

Proof. We first claim that $\vec{\xi}$ restricted to the regular stratum N_0 is a foliated vector field, i.e. a basic vector field with respect to the local submersions that describe the regular foliation on $\mathcal{F}_N^0 \cap N_0$. Let $\tilde{\xi}$ be the foliated vector field of L_p so that $\tilde{\xi}(p) = \vec{\xi}(p)$. Note that $\tilde{\xi}$ is normal to each fiber N_z since each fiber N_z is invariant under the foliation $\mathcal{F}_N^0$. Finally, due to equation (3.1), we note that, for every x in the leaf L_p, the horizontal geodesics α_x (with respect the submersion $\mathsf{p}_N : N \to D$) given by $\alpha_x(t) = \exp_x(t\tilde{\xi})$ project to the same geodesic in D. This implies that $\tilde{\xi}(x) = \vec{\xi}(x)$ for each $x \in L_p$ and concludes the proof of the claim.

Now note that α_x can not contain a singular point $\alpha_x(t_0)$. Otherwise the above claim and equifocality [7] would imply that two lifts of a geodesic in D with respect to the submersion p_N should intersect at $\alpha_x(t_0)$, contradiction. Therefore α_x is always contained in the regular stratum.

Finally, induction and the same argument as above imply that $\vec{\xi}$ restricted to each stratum is a foliated vector field and for a fixed x the horizontal geodesic α_x is always contained in the same stratum.

□

Now we want to extend the vector field $\vec{Y}$ defined on $N|_Y$ to a vector field on N. If the orbit Y is not a single point, then N admits a regular foliation $\{N|_{Y_p}\}_{p\in D}$ whose leaves are the subbundles $N|_{Y_p}$ where $Y_p \subset D$ is the orbit at $p \in D$. In this case the most natural choice would be to consider the "parallel" vector field, i.e., $\vec{Y}(\eta_\xi(x)) := d(\eta_\xi)_x\vec{Y}(x)$ where $\eta_\xi(x) := \exp_x(\vec{\xi})$ is the end point map, that turns out to be a diffeomorphism between the leaves $N|_Y$ and $N|_{Y_p}$ for $p := \eta_\xi(q) \in D$. Considering all equivariant vector field $\vec{\xi}$ and using the fact that the orbits in D have no singular point, one could check that $\vec{Y}$ is smooth.

In other words, if the orbit $Y := Y_q \subset D$ is not a single point, then the vector field $\vec{Y} \in \mathfrak{X}(N)$ is defined so that the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{tikzcd}
T(N|_{Y_q}) \arrow[r, "(\eta_\xi)_*"] & T(N|_{Y_p}) \\
N|_{Y_q} \arrow[u, "\vec{Y}"] \arrow[r, "\eta_\xi"] & N|_{Y_p} \arrow[u, "\vec{Y}"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $Y_p \subset D$ is the orbit at $p := \eta_\xi(q) \in D$.

This turns out to be the right choice of vector field $\vec{Y}$. But it is also necessary to take into consideration the case where the orbit $Y \subset D$ is a single point. In order to include both case simultaneously, we generalize the above definition.

Let $\mathsf{p}^\nu : N \to N|_Y$ be the foot point projection. Let $\vec{v}(x)$ be the only vector normal to the orbit $Y \subset D$ such that $\exp(\vec{v}(x)) = \mathsf{p}_N(x)$, where $\mathsf{p}_N : N \to D$ is the submersion defined before. Note that the foot point of $\vec{v}(x)$ is $z = \mathsf{p}_N \circ \mathsf{p}^\nu(x)$. Now let $\vec{\xi}_{t,x}$ be the basic vector field along the fiber $N_{\varphi_t(z)}$ that projects to $(\varphi_t)_* \vec{v}(x)$. Set $\beta(x,t) := \varphi_t \circ \mathsf{p}^\nu(x) \in N|_Y$. We can finally define

$$\vec{Y}(x) := \frac{d}{dt} \exp_{\beta(x,t)}(\vec{\xi}_{t,x})|_{t=0}. \tag{3.11}$$

Lemma 3.11. *The flow of $\vec{Y}$ projects to a flow on $N/\mathcal{F}_N$.*

Proof. Consider two vector fields $\vec{\xi}_1$ and $\vec{\xi}_2$ constructed as above so that $\vec{\xi}_i$ restrict to the orbit $Y \subset D$ projects to the same vector in the orbifold $D/\mathcal{F}_N$. This implies in particular that there exists an isometry k of D so that $\vec{\xi}_2(k \cdot y) = k_* \vec{\xi}_1(y)$ for each $y \in Y \subset D$.

Since k is a holonomy element of $\mathcal{F}|_\Sigma$ it can be extended to an $\mathcal{F}_N^0$ foliated diffeomorphism $k : N \to N$.

Now consider two leaves L_1 and L_2 in N_Y of a nonconnected leaf of $\mathcal{F}_N$ and so that $L_2 = k \cdot L_1$. For a point $x_1 \in L_1$ set $x_2 \in L_2$ as $x_2 := k \cdot x_1$.

Define the geodesics $t \to \alpha_i := \exp_{x_i}(t\vec{\xi}_i(x_i))$. We first claim

$$\pi_{\mathcal{F}_N}(\alpha_1) = \pi_{\mathcal{F}_N}(\alpha_2), \tag{3.12}$$

where $\pi_{\mathcal{F}_N} : N \to N/\mathcal{F}_N$ is the quotient projection.

Equation (3.12) follows from

$$\pi_{\mathcal{F}_N^0}(k \cdot \alpha_1) = \pi_{\mathcal{F}_N^0}(\alpha_2). \tag{3.13}$$

Equation (3.13) in turn follows from equation (3.1) and from the next equation:

$$\mathsf{p}_{N/\mathcal{F}_N^0}(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_N^0}(k \cdot \alpha_1)) = \mathsf{p}_{N/\mathcal{F}_N^0}(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_N^0}(\alpha_2)),$$

where $\mathsf{p}_{N/\mathcal{F}_N^0} : N/\mathcal{F}_N^0 \to D$ is the induced submetry.

Let β_i be the integral curve of $\vec{Y}$ starting at x_i. Note that by construction of $\vec{Y}$ restrict to N_Y we have $\pi_{\mathcal{F}_N}(\beta_1) = \pi_{\mathcal{F}_N}(\beta_2)$. This fact and equation (3.12) imply

$$\pi_{\mathcal{F}_N}(h_1) = \pi_{\mathcal{F}_N}(h_2). \tag{3.14}$$

where $h_i(s,t) := \exp_{\beta_i(s)}(t\xi_i \circ \beta_i(s))$.

Finally equation (3.14) and Lemma 3.10 conclude the proof of the lemma.

□

The next lemma concludes the proof of the proposition.

Lemma 3.12. *The projection of the flow of $\vec{Y}$ coincides with the flow φ.*

Proof. Consider $x_1 \in Y \subset D$, $y_1 = \varphi_t(x_1) \in D$. Let x_2 be a point in N so that $\mathsf{p}_N(x_2) = x_1$ and y_2 a point in the integral curve of the vector field $\vec{Y}$ (restricted to the bundle $N|_Y$) passing at x_2 defined as $y_2 = \varphi_t(x_2)$. Now define the following geodesics: $\alpha_{x_1}(s) := \exp_{x_1}(s\xi)$ and $\alpha_{y_1}(s) := \exp_{y_1}(s(\varphi_t)_*\xi)$. Also define $\alpha_{x_2}(s) =$

$\exp_{x_2}(s\vec{\xi}(x_2))$ where $\vec{\xi}$ is the lift of ξ and $\alpha_{y_2}(s) := \exp_{y_2}(s\vec{\xi_t}(y_2))$ where $\vec{\xi_t}$ is the lift of $(\varphi_t)_*\xi$.

Let $\pi_{\mathcal{F}_N} : N \to N/\mathcal{F}_N$ be the quotient map.

It suffices to check that

$$\pi_{\mathcal{F}_N} \circ \alpha_{y_2}(1) = \varphi_t \circ \pi_{\mathcal{F}_N} \circ \alpha_{x_2}(1) \tag{3.15}$$

Like (3.1) we know that:

$$\widetilde{\mathsf{p}}_N = \mathsf{p}_{N/\mathcal{F}_N} \circ \pi_{\mathcal{F}_N} \tag{3.16}$$

where $\mathsf{p}_{N/\mathcal{F}_N} : N/\mathcal{F}_N \to D/\mathcal{F}_N$ and $\widetilde{\mathsf{p}}_N : N \to D/\mathcal{F}_N$ are the natural submetries.

Apart from the above equation we also know that:

$$\mathsf{p}_{N/\mathcal{F}_N} \circ \varphi_t = \varphi_t \circ \mathsf{p}_{N/\mathcal{F}_N} \tag{3.17}$$

$$\widetilde{\mathsf{p}}_N \circ \alpha_{y_2} = \pi_{\mathcal{F}_N} \circ \alpha_{y_1},\ \widetilde{\mathsf{p}}_N \circ \alpha_{x_2} = \pi_{\mathcal{F}_N} \circ \alpha_{x_1} \tag{3.18}$$

$$\pi_{\mathcal{F}_N} \circ \alpha_{y_1} = \varphi_t \circ \pi_{\mathcal{F}_N} \circ \alpha_{x_1} \tag{3.19}$$

$$\pi_{\mathcal{F}_N} \circ \alpha_{y_2}(0) = \varphi_t \circ \pi_{\mathcal{F}_N} \circ \alpha_{x_2}(0) \tag{3.20}$$

Therefore equations (3.18) and (3.19) imply

$$\widetilde{\mathsf{p}}_N \circ \alpha_{y_2} = \varphi_t \circ \pi_{\mathcal{F}_N} \circ \alpha_{x_1} \tag{3.21}$$

It follows from equations (3.21) and (3.16) that

$$\varphi_t \circ \pi_{\mathcal{F}_N} \circ \alpha_{x_1} = \mathsf{p}_{N/\mathcal{F}_N} \circ \pi_{\mathcal{F}_N} \circ \alpha_{y_2} \tag{3.22}$$

Equations (3.18) and (3.16) imply

$$\pi_{\mathcal{F}_N} \circ \alpha_{x_1} = \mathsf{p}_{N/\mathcal{F}_N} \circ \pi_{\mathcal{F}_N} \circ \alpha_{x_2} \tag{3.23}$$

From equations (3.23) and (3.17) we infer

$$\varphi_t \circ \pi_{\mathcal{F}_N} \circ \alpha_{x_1} = \mathsf{p}_{N/\mathcal{F}_N} \circ \varphi_t \circ \pi_{\mathcal{F}_N} \circ \alpha_{x_2} \tag{3.24}$$

Now equation (3.15) follows from (3.22), (3.24) and (3.20)

□

□

4. Molino's conjeture: proof of Theorem 1.7

In this section we will use notations and ideas that appear in the proof of Theorem 1.4.

First note that the closure $\overline{L}$ of each leaf L of $\mathcal{F}$ is a closed submanifold. This can be proved using the fact that if L and its closure $\overline{L}$ are contained in the same stratum and by the structure theorem of Molino [13]; for non compact case see Salem [13, Appendix D].

Now we note that the partition $\overline{\mathcal{F}} = \{\overline{L}\}_{L\in\mathcal{F}}$ is Riemannian, i.e. the plaques of $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ are locally equidistant. In fact, the equifocality of $\mathcal{F}$ (cf. [7]) implies that plaques of $\mathcal{F}$ are equidistant to a plaque of $\overline{L}_q$ and hence that the plaques of $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ are equidistant to a plaque of $\overline{L}_q$; see similar argument in [2, Proposition 2.13].

In what follows we will prove that this partition is a smooth singular foliation.

Let $q \in \Sigma$ be a fixed point and consider the same submanifold N defined in the proof of Theorem 1.4, i.e. we consider $D \subset \Sigma$ a slice to the foliation $\mathcal{F}|_\Sigma$ that contains q and for each $p \in D$ we define $N_p := \exp_p(\nu_p\Sigma \cap B_\epsilon(0))$ and we set $N := \cup_{p \in D} N_p$. Finally consider $\mathcal{F}_N := \mathcal{F} \cap N$ the intersection of $\mathcal{F}$ with the manifold N.

We want to prove that for each given vector v with footpoint q tangent to $\Sigma \cap N$ and to the closure of the leaf L_q in Σ, there exists a vector field $\vec{Y}$ tangent to the leaves of $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ so that $\vec{Y}(q) = v$.

Here we no longer need to consider $\mathcal{F}_N$ as a foliation with nonconnected leaves.

We will consider a metric $\tilde{\mathrm{g}}$ on N with the same *transverse metric* of $\mathcal{F}$; i.e. so that the leaves of $\mathcal{F}_N$ has the same distance as the plaques of $\mathcal{F}$ that contains such leaves; see Lemma 3.1.

The same kind of argument used in the proof of Proposition 3.9 (i.e. basic vector fields of the submersion $\mathsf{p}_N : N \to D$ are foliated vector field of $\mathcal{F}_N$) allow us to conclude that there exists a compact group G_q that acts smoothly on N and such that the leaves of the singular Riemannian foliation $\mathcal{F}_N$ are orbits of this action. In other words $\mathcal{F}_N$ is homogenous. Note that it is not necessarily Riemannian homogeneous, i.e. the group G_q does not need to act isometrically on N. But this fact is not important because in order to apply [15] we only need a smooth proper action.

Let L be a leaf in the singular stratum Σ and α a curve in L. Consider a submanifold N_0 that contains $\alpha(0)$ and N_1 that contains $\alpha(1)$ as above. Let $\mathcal{F}_{N_0}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{N_1}$ be the induced foliation on N_0 and N_1 respectively.

Following the flow of vector fields tangent to the leaves we have a diffeomorphism between N_0 and N_1 that sends leaves of $\mathcal{F}_{N_0}$ to leaves of $\mathcal{F}_{N_1}$. Due to the properties of the metric $\tilde{\mathrm{g}}^i$ on N_i defined in Lemma 3.1, this diffeomorphism induces an isometry $\tau_{[\alpha]} : (N_0, \tilde{\mathrm{g}}^0)/\mathcal{F}_{N_0} \to (N_1, \tilde{\mathrm{g}}^1)/\mathcal{F}_{N_1}$ that depends only on the homotopy class of α.

Now we consider a curve α with initial and final point in N so that τ_α is an isometry on $(N, \tilde{\mathrm{g}})/\mathcal{F}_N$. Let $\mathrm{Hol}(\mathcal{F}_N)$ be the pseudogroup in the metric space $(N, \tilde{\mathrm{g}})/\mathcal{F}_N$ generated by all isometries τ_α, for all curves α with initial and final point in N. Let $\mathrm{Hol}(\mathcal{F}_N)|_D$ be the restriction of this pseudogroup to D.

Using Molino's theorem in the regular foliation $\mathcal{F}|_\Sigma$ and the definition of τ_α we can conclude that $\pi_{\mathcal{F}_N *} v$ is tangent to the orbit of the closure of $\mathrm{Hol}(\mathcal{F}_N)|_D$.

Let $(\widehat{N}, \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_N, \widehat{\tilde{\mathrm{g}}})$ be the desingularization of $(N, \mathcal{F}_N, \tilde{\mathrm{g}})$ (recall Section 2); in order to avoid cumbersome notations, here we are using the notion $\widehat{N}$ also to denote the desingularized space and not only the first blow-up along the minimal stratum. Like in Lemma 2.4 (see also Remark 2.6) we can lift the isometry $\tau_{[\alpha]}$ to an isometry $\hat{\tau}$ of the orbifold $(\widehat{N}, \widehat{\tilde{\mathrm{g}}})/\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_N$.

Let H be the closure of the pseudogroup generated by all isometries $\hat{\tau}$ constructed in this way. By Salem [13, Appendix D] this is a Lie pseudo group.

We claim that we can find a Killing vector field $\widehat{\bar{Y}}$ in the orbifold $(\widehat{N}, \widehat{\tilde{\mathrm{g}}})/\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_N$ with flow $\hat{\varphi}$ such that $\hat{\varphi}_t \in H$, the vector field $\widehat{\bar{Y}}$ restricted to $\widehat{D}$ projects to a derivative $\bar{Y}$ and so that $\bar{Y}_{\pi_{\mathcal{F}_N}(q)} = \pi_{\mathcal{F}_N *} v$.

In order to understand the above claim, first note that each element of the closed Lie pseudo-group $\overline{\mathrm{Hol}(\mathcal{F}_N)|_D}$ admits a lift $h \in H$. On the other hand consider the induced map $\hat{\rho}|_{\widehat{D}} : \widehat{D}/\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_N \to D/\mathcal{F}_N$. Each (possibly nonconnected) orbit of H is closed in $\widehat{D}/\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_N$ (see [13, Appendix D Corollary 3.2]) and therefore intersects the fiber $\hat{\rho}|_{\widehat{D}}^{-1}(q)$ only in a finite number of connected subsets. Therefore $\hat{\rho}(H(\hat{q}))$ consists of a finite union of connected submanifolds contained in the orbit

$\overline{\mathrm{Hol}(\mathcal{F}_N)|_D}(q)$. These facts together imply that the derivative of $\hat{\rho}|_{\widehat{D}}$ sends the tangent space of the orbit $H(\hat{q})$ onto the tangent space of the orbit $\overline{\mathrm{Hol}(\mathcal{F}_N)|_D}(q)$ and the claim follows.

Finally, let φ be the flow of isometries on $(N, \tilde{\mathrm{g}})/\mathcal{F}_N$ that comes from the projection of the flow $\hat{\varphi}$ of $\widehat{\vec{Y}}$.

Since $(N, \mathcal{F}_N)$ is homogenous, it follows from Theorem 1.4 that φ is smooth. From Schwarz [15, Corollary 2.4] we can lift φ and produce the smooth vector field $\vec{Y}$ on N tangent to v. Finally, using the flow of vector fields tangent to the leaves, one can extend the vector field $\vec{Y}$ on N to a vector field on an neighborhood of q in M that is tangent to the leaves of $\mathcal{F}$ and this concludes the proof.

Appendix A. Linearized vector fields and orbit-like foliations

In this appendix we review the concept of linearized vector field introduced in [13] and prove, among other results, the following:

1. The linearization of the infinitesimal foliation $\mathcal{F}_p$ gives the Riemannian homogenous part of $\mathcal{F}_p$. Therefore a locally closed foliation $\mathcal{F}$ is orbit-like if and only if the infinitesimal foliation is linearizable.
2. There are vectors fields in $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{F})$ that are invariant by homothetic transformation; here, as in Definition 1.1, we denote $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{F})$ as the module of vector fields that are always tangent to the leaves of $\mathcal{F}$.
3. There exists a linearized flow that provides an isometry between tangent spaces of slices at points in the same leaf.

Let $(M, \mathcal{F})$ be a singular Riemannian foliation on a manifold M, and let L be a singular leaf. Given $p \in L$, let P_p denote a plaque (i.e. a neighborhood of p in L). In [7] new metrics $\tilde{g}$, $\tilde{g}_\lambda$ and g_0 were created on $Tub(P_p) \simeq \nu(P_p)$. Let's point out that $\tilde{g}$ and g_0 depend on the choice of a family $\mathcal{X}$ of vertical vector fields $\{\vec{X}_1, \dots \vec{X}_k\}$ on $Tub(P_q)$ that are everywhere linearly independent and provide a basis for the points of P_p. Nevertheless, the metric of $g_0|_{\nu_p P_p}$ is intrinsically defined.

A family $\mathcal{X}$ defined as above gives rise to a sub-foliation $\mathcal{F}^2$, and a $\tilde{g}$-orthogonal splitting $T(Tub(P_p)) := \mathcal{A} \oplus \mathcal{B}$, where $\mathcal{A} = T\mathcal{F}^2$ and $\mathcal{B}$ is the tangent space to the slices. From now on, we will look at $\nu_p(P_p)$ instead of $Tub(P_p)$. In particular, if $\vec{X}$ is a vector field with components $\vec{X} = \vec{X}^A + \vec{X}^B$, then $\vec{X}^B$ is always tangent to the fibers, and the restriction to one fiber $\vec{X}^B|_{\nu_q P_p}$ can be seen as a vector field on a vector space.

For P_p small enough, $\nu P_p \simeq P_p \times \mathbb{R}^m$, and we can write a point in νP_p as a couple (q, v). Again for every vector field $\vec{X}$, the projection $\vec{X}^B$ is a vector field tangent to the fibers, so $\vec{X}^B|_{\nu_q P_p}$ is a vector field on a vector space.

Definition A.1. Consider $\vec{Y} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{F})$. For any $\lambda \in (0,1)$, define $\vec{Y}_\lambda$ as

$$(\vec{Y}_\lambda)_p = (h_\lambda)_*^{-1} \vec{Y}_{h_\lambda(p)},$$

and let $\vec{Y}^L = \lim_{\lambda \to 0} \vec{Y}_\lambda$. Such vector field $\vec{Y}^L$ is called *linearization* of $\vec{Y}$. If $\vec{Y}^L = \vec{Y}$, then $\vec{Y}$ is called *linearized.*

Example A.2. Consider a SRF foliation $\mathcal{F}$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, where $\{0\}$ is a leaf. Given a smooth vector field $\vec{X} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{F})$ defined around 0, the corresponding linearized vector field is given by

$$\vec{X}^L_v = \lim_{\lambda\to 0}(h_\lambda)^{-1}_* \vec{X}_{h_\lambda(v)} = \lim_{\lambda\to 0}\frac{1}{\lambda}\vec{X}_{\lambda v} = \left(\nabla_v \vec{X}\right)_0 .$$

In other words, $\vec{X}^L_{(\cdot)} = \left(\nabla_{(\cdot)}\vec{X}\right)_0$ and in particular it is a linear vector field. Moreover, since $\vec{X}^L \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{F})$, it is tangent to the distance spheres around 0, and therefore

$$0 = \langle \vec{X}^L_v, v\rangle = \langle \left(\nabla_v \vec{X}\right)_0, v\rangle$$

In other words, the linear vector field $\vec{X}^L_{(\cdot)} = (\nabla_{(\cdot)}\vec{X})_0$ is determined by a matrix which is skew-symmetric and hence $\vec{X}^L$ is a Killing vector field.

With this example in mind, we can proceed to describe the generic situation:

Proposition A.3. *Let P_p, $Tub(P_p)$ defined as before, and let $\pi : Tub(P_p) \to P_p$ be the closest-point projection map. Let $\vec{Y} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{F})$. Then:*

- *(a) $\vec{Y}^L$ is well defined, and is smooth.*
- *(b) $\vec{Y}^L$ belongs to $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{F})$.*
- *(c) $\vec{Y}^L$ is invariant under the homothetic transformations $h_{\lambda *}$. In particular $(\vec{Y}^L)^L = \vec{Y}^L$, i.e. the linearization of a vector field is a linearized vector field, and the terminology makes sense.*
- *(d) $\vec{Y}^L$ is basic with respect to π.*
- *(e) $\vec{Y}^L|_{P_p} = \vec{Y}|_{P_p}$.*

Proof of (a) Notice that this statement is local, and only depends on the structure of vector space on $\pi : Tub(P_p) \to P_p$. Everything can thus be reduced to the case of $\mathbb{R}^{n+k} \to \mathbb{R}^n$, and if $\vec{X}$ splits as $\vec{X}_A + \vec{X}_B$, $\vec{X}_A \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\vec{X}_B \in \mathbb{R}^k$, then one can easily see that, as in example A.2, the following holds:

$$\vec{X}^L_{(v,w)} = \left(\vec{X}_A\right)_{(v,0)} + \left(\nabla_w \vec{X}_B\right)_{(v,0)}$$

where ∇ is the Euclidean connection. This convergence is pointwise, and the resulting limit is smooth. This implies that the convergence is uniform on compact sets.

Proof of (b) This part follows since every $\vec{Y}_\lambda \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{F})$, and therefore $\vec{Y}^L = \lim_{\lambda\to 0}\left(\vec{Y}_\lambda\right)$ belongs to $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{F})$ as well.

Proof of (c) We compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{s*}\vec{X}^L_q &= h_{s*}\lim_{\lambda\to 0}(h_{\frac{1}{\lambda}})_* \vec{X}_{h_\lambda(q)} \\
&= \lim_{\lambda\to 0} h_{s*}(h_{\frac{1}{\lambda}})_* \vec{X}_{h_\lambda(q)} \\
&= \lim_{\lambda\to 0}(h_{\frac{s}{\lambda}})_* \vec{X}_{h_\lambda(q)} \\
&= \lim_{\lambda/s\to 0}(h_{\frac{1}{\lambda/s}})_* \vec{X}_{h_{\lambda/s}(h_s(q))} \\
&= \vec{X}^L_{h_s(q)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of (d) Notice first of all that for any $q \in Tub(P_p)$, $\pi(q) = \lim_{\lambda\to 0} h_\lambda(q)$ and $\pi_* = \lim_{\lambda\to 0} h_{\lambda *}$. Let's now compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_*\vec{X}^L_q &= \lim_{\lambda\to 0} h_{\lambda *}\vec{X}^L_q \\
&= \lim_{\lambda\to 0} \vec{X}^L_{h_\lambda(q)} \\
&= \vec{X}^L_{\lim h_\lambda(q)} \\
&= \vec{X}^L_{\pi(q)}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the second equation we used the invariance of linearized vector fields under homoteties, as proved in the last item. In the third and fourth equation we used the continuity of $\vec{X}^L$ and the observation that $\pi = \lim_{\lambda\to 0} h_\lambda$.

Proof of (e) This simply follows from the fact that $\vec{Y}_\lambda|_{P_p} = \vec{Y}|_{P_p}$.

□

From the last point in the proposition above it follows that given a family $\mathcal{X} = \{\vec{X}_1, \dots \vec{X}_k\}$ of vertical vector fields as above, the "linearized family" $\mathcal{X}^L = \{\vec{X}^L_1, \dots \vec{X}^L_k\}$ is also linearly independent.

Proposition A.4. *Let $\vec{Y}$ be a linearized vector field on $Tub(P_p)$. Moreover, let $\mathcal{X}$ be a family of vector fields as above. Then*

- *(a) $(\vec{Y}^L)^A$, $(\vec{Y}^L)^B$ belong to $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{F})$.*
- *(b) If $\mathcal{X}$ is a linearized family, and $z = z^A + z^B$ is a vertical vector at (q, v),*
$$g_0(\vec{Y}^L, z)_{(q,v)} = g(\pi_*\vec{Y}^A, \pi_*(z^A))_{(q,0)} + g(\nabla_v \vec{Y}^B, z^B)_{(q,0)},$$
where the connection is the Euclidean connection on the fiber $\nu_q P_p$. In particular $(\vec{Y}^L)^A$ is the horizontal lift of $\vec{Y}^A_{(q,0)}$, and $(\vec{Y}^L)^B$ can be thought of as the linear vector field $(\nabla\vec{Y}^B)_{(q,0)}$.
- *(c) $(\vec{Y}^L)^B = (\vec{Y}^B)^L$ is a Killing vector field. In addition, if G_p the group of isometries whose Lie algebra is the span of the subspace $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{F}_p)^L$ then the orbits of G_p are the maximal homogeneous subfoliation of the infinitesimal foliation $\mathcal{F}_p$. In particular, for locally closed foliations, $\mathcal{F}_p$ is Riemannian homogenous if and only if the orbits of G_p coincides with the leaves of $\mathcal{F}_p$.*
- *(d) $(\phi^t_{Y^L})_{(q,v)} = (\phi^t_{Y^L})_{*(q,0)}$ and therefore the flow of $\vec{Y}^L$ is a linear map between fibers (and therefore providing a reason for the terminology).*
- *(e) The flow of Y^L is an isometry between fibers.*
- *(f) $(\nu P_p, g_0)$ splits metrically as $(P_p, g|_{P_p}) \times (\nu_p P_p, g_p)$.*

Proof of (a)

We know that both $\vec{Y}^L$ and $(\vec{Y}^L)^A$ belong to $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{F})$, and so must be $(\vec{Y}^L)^B$.

Proof of (b) Let's compute:

$$\tilde{g}_\lambda(\vec{Y}_\lambda, z)_{(q,v)} = \tilde{g}^1\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}(h_\lambda)_*\left((h_\lambda)_*^{-1}\vec{Y}\right)^B, \frac{1}{\lambda}(h_\lambda)_* z^B\right)_{(q,\lambda v)} + g(\pi_*\vec{Y}^A, \pi_*(z^A))_{(q,0)}$$

Since $\mathcal{X}$ is linearized, it is preserved under the homothetic transformations, and for every vector x we have $(h_\lambda)_* x^B = \left((h_\lambda)_* x\right)^B$. The equation above then becomes

$$\tilde{g}_\lambda(\vec{Y}_\lambda, z)_{(q,v)} = \tilde{g}^1\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\vec{Y}^B, \frac{1}{\lambda}(h_\lambda)_* z^B\right)_{(q,\lambda v)} + g(\pi_*\vec{Y}^A, \pi_*(z^A))_{(q,0)}$$

Since $\vec{Y} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{F})$, it is parallel to $\mathcal{F}^2$ at the zero section, and so $\vec{Y}^B_{(q,0)} = 0$. In particular $\lim_{\lambda\to 0} \frac{1}{\lambda}\vec{Y}^B_{(q,\lambda v)} = \nabla_v \vec{Y}^B$, where the connection is the Euclidean connection on the fiber $\nu_q P_p$. Moreover $\lim_{\lambda\to 0}\frac{1}{\lambda}(h_\lambda)_* z^B = z^B$. Therefore taking the limit of the equation above, we get

$$\begin{aligned} g_0(\vec{Y}^L, z)_{(q,v)} &= \lim_{\lambda\to 0} \tilde{g}^1\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\vec{Y}^B, \frac{1}{\lambda}(h_\lambda)_* z^B\right)_{(q,\lambda v)} + g(\pi_*\vec{Y}^A, \pi_*(z^A))_{(q,0)} \\ &= \tilde{g}^1\left(\nabla_v \vec{Y}^B, z^B\right)_{(q,0)} + g(\pi_*\vec{Y}^A, \pi_*(z^A))_{(q,0)} \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows since $\tilde{g}^1_{(q,0)} = \left(g|_{\mathcal{B}}\right)_{(q,0)}$.

Proof of (c) It follows direct from item (b), from the argument of Example A.2 and from the maximality of G_p.

Proof of (d) Since $\vec{Y}^L$ is linearized, by Proposition A.3 it is basic with respect to the projection $\pi : \nu P_p \to P_p$, and in particular its flow preserves the fibers of π. For any general $\vec{X}$, the flow of $\vec{X}_\lambda = (h_\lambda)_*^{-1}\vec{X}$ is given by $\phi^t_{X_\lambda} = h_\lambda^{-1}\circ \phi^t_X \circ h_\lambda$. Since $\vec{Y}^L$ is linearized, by what we said before, the map $\phi^t_{Y^L}|_{\pi^{-1}(q)}$ is a (possibly nonlinear) map between vector spaces. Call $F := \phi^t_{Y^L}|_{\nu_p L} : \nu_p L \to \nu_q L$. Then $\phi^t_{(Y^L)_\lambda}$ also sends the fiber at p to the fiber at q, and the restriction of $\phi^t_{(Y^L)_\lambda}$ on these fibers is given by $F_\lambda(v) = \frac{1}{\lambda}F(\lambda v)$. Taking the limit as $\lambda \to 0$, we obtain that $\lim_{\lambda\to 0} F_\lambda = (F_*)_0$. In other words, the flow of $(\vec{Y}^L)^L = \vec{Y}^L$ is given by the differential of the flow of $\vec{Y}^L$ at 0. Here we have used the fact that $\vec{Y}_\lambda$ converges to $\vec{Y}^L$ uniformly on compact sets, see proof of item (a) Proposition A.3.

Proof of (e) We said in the paragraph above that the flow of Y^L is a linear map. Moreover, since the flow preserves the foliation, it preserves the distance between leaves and therefore $\|\phi^t_{Y^L}(v)\| = \|v\|$ for every $v \in \nu_p L$. Therefore it is an isometry.

Proof of (f) From the formula at point (b) it follows that $\pi : (Tub(P_p), g_0) \to (P_p, g|_{P_p})$ is a Riemannian submersion. Moreover, the holonomy maps (in the riemannian submersion sense) are flows of linearized vector fields always tangent to $\mathcal{A}$, and therefore they are isometries between fibers. This is equivalent to the fibers being totally geodesic and the S-tensor of the submersion $\nu(P_p) \to P_p$ is zero. Since moreover the horizontal distribution is integrable (the leaves of $\mathcal{F}^2$ are the integral manifolds) then the O'Neill tensor is zero as well. By [10, Theorem 1.4.1], having $S \equiv 0, A \equiv 0$ implies that the distribution locally splits, and since $\nu(P_p)$ can be taken simply connected, then the metric splitting becomes global.

□

We conclude this section discussing how the above result can be used to understand the relation between the smooth structure of local and global quotient.

Let $\mathrm{Iso}(\nu_p L_p, \mathcal{F}_p)$ denote the isometries of $\nu_p L_p$ whose elements preserve the infinitesimal foliation $\mathcal{F}_p$, i.e. that send leaves to leaves. Let us also denote G_p the subgroup of $\mathrm{Iso}(\nu_p L_p, \mathcal{F}_p)$whose elements fix the leaves of the foliation $\mathcal{F}_p$, i.e. that send each leaf to itself (but not necessary fixing each point of the fixed leaf).

The foliation induced by G_p on $\nu^1_p L$ will be called the *homogeneous kernel* of $\mathcal{F}_p$.

Note that a A SRF $(M, \mathcal{F})$ is orbit-like at a point $p \in M$ if the homogeneous kernel of $\nu^1_p L$ is the whole infinitesimal foliation $\mathcal{F}_p$.

Let L_p be a closed leaf through a point p, and let $\gamma : [0,1] \to L_p$ be a closed path in L_p with base point p. We want to define a singular holonomy map τ :

$\pi_1(L_p,p) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Iso}(\nu_p L_p, \mathcal{F}_p)/G_p$ in the following way: take a partition $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \ldots < t_k = 1$ of $[0,1]$, such that each $\gamma|_{(t_i,t_{i+1})}$ is contained in a plaque P_i, and call $p_i = \gamma(t_i)$. For each plaque, choose a linearized vector field $\vec{X}_i$ on $Tub(P_i)$ such that $\gamma|_{(t_i,t_{i+1})}$ is an integral curve for $\vec{X}_i$. According to proposition A.4 above, the flow ϕ_i of $\vec{X}_i$ defines an isometry between the infinitesimal foliations $(\nu^1_{p_i} L_p, \nu^1_{p_i}\mathcal{F})$ and $(\nu^1_{p_{i+1}} L_p, \nu^1_{p_{i+1}}\mathcal{F})$. Finally, define

$$\tau_{(\gamma, X_0,\ldots,X_{k-1})} = \phi_{k-1} \circ \ldots \phi_1 \circ \phi_0 \in \mathrm{Iso}(\nu^1_p L_p, \mathcal{F}_p).$$

Of course, this map depends on the choice of the linearized vector fields $\vec{X}_i$. Still, if $(\vec{Y}_1,\ldots \vec{Y}_k)$ is a different choice of linearized vector fields, $\tau_{(\gamma,Y_0,\ldots Y_{k-1})}$ differs from $\tau_{(\gamma,X_0,\ldots,X_{k-1})}$ by an element of G_p. In particular, it makes sense to define τ_γ as the projection of some $\tau_{(\gamma,X_0,\ldots,X_{k-1})}$ on $\mathrm{Iso}(\nu_p L_p, \mathcal{F}_p)/G_p$. Notice moreover that if γ_1 and γ_2 are homotopic, then $\tau_{\gamma_1} = \tau_{\gamma_2}$, and it is well defined a map

$$\tau : \pi_1(L_p, p) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Iso}(\nu_p L_p, \mathcal{F}_p)/G_p.$$

Since G_p is normal in $\mathrm{Iso}(\nu_p L_p, \mathcal{F}_p)$, we have that $\mathrm{Iso}(\nu_p L_p, \mathcal{F}_p)/G_p$ is a group, and τ is a group homomorphism. Call H the image $\tau(\pi_1(L_p,p))$. H acts in a natural way on $C^k_b(\nu_p L_p, \mathcal{F}_p)$: in fact, given $[h] \in H$, choose a representative $h_0 \in \mathrm{Iso}_p$ of $[h]$, and define $[h]\cdot f = h_0^* f$. Moreover we have the following " foliated slice theorem for functions":

Proposition A.5. *Let $(M,\mathcal{F})$ be a SRF, L a closed leaf, and U_ϵ a tubular neighborhood of radius ϵ around L. Let S_ϵ be a slice at a point $p \in L$, Let $(\nu_p L, \mathcal{F}_p)$ be the infinitesimal foliation at p, and let $\rho = \exp : \nu^\epsilon L \to U_\epsilon$. Then*

$$\rho^* C^\infty_b(U_\epsilon, \mathcal{F}) = C^\infty_b(\nu^\epsilon_p L, \mathcal{F}_p)^H$$

Proof. the inclusion $\subseteq$ is obvious. As for the inclusion $\supseteq$: take a function $f \in C^\infty_b(\nu^\epsilon_p, \mathcal{F}_p)^H$, that we can think of as a function on the slice S_p. We are going to construct a basic function $\tilde{f}$, defined on the whole U_ϵ whose restriction to S_p is f. If q is another point of L_p, we can define $\tilde{f}$ on S_q by joining q and p with a simple curve γ, take a vector field X around γ such that $X(\gamma(t)) = \gamma'(t)$, extend X locally, to a vertical vector field $\tilde{X}$, and finally take the linearized vector field $\tilde{X}^L$. By the results proven above, the flow $\phi_{\tilde{X}^L}$ takes (S_q, g_0) isometrically to (S_p, g_0), and one can define $\tilde{f}|_{S_q} = (\phi_{\tilde{X}^L})_* f|_{S_p}$. Notice that, since f is constant on the leaves and it is invariant under H, the result does not depend on the choices made and $\tilde{f}$ is well defined. Moreover, by local considerations $\tilde{f}$ is also smooth, and the proposition is proved.

REFERENCES

1. M. M. Alexandrino, *Proofs of conjectures about singular Riemannian foliations,* Geom. Dedicata **119** (2006) no. 1, 219-234.
2. M.M. Alexandrino, *Desingularization of singular Riemannian foliation*, Geom. Dedicata vol. 149 (2010), no. 1, 397–416.
3. M.M. Alexandrino, *Polar foliations and isoparametric maps*, Annals of Global Analysis and Geometry **41** (2012), no. 2, Pages 187–198
4. M. M. Alexandrino, R. Briquet, D. Toeben, *Progress in the Theory of Singular Riemannian Foliations* Preprint (2012), arXiv:1203.6829v1
5. M.M. Alexandrino and A. Lytchak, *On smoothness of isometries between orbit spaces*, Preprint (2011) arXiv:1107.2563v1.

6. M. M. Alexandrino and M. Radeschi *Isometries between leaf spaces*, Preprint (2012) arXiv:1111.6178v1
7. M. M. Alexandrino and D. Töben, *Equifocality of singular Riemannian foliations*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **136** (2008), no. 9, 3271–3280.
8. L. C. Evans,*Partial Differential Equations*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics **19**, American Mathematical Society, 1998.
9. C.Gorodski and A. Lytchak, *On orbit spaces of representations of compact Lie groups*, Preprint (2012) arXiv:1109.1739 [math.DG].
10. D. Gromoll and G Walschap, *Metric Foliations and Curvatures*, Progress in Mathematics **268**, Birkhäuser, 2009.
11. A. Lytchak, *Polar foliations on symmetric spaces*, Preprint (2012) arXiv:1204.2923 [math.DG].
12. A. Lytchak and G. Thorbergsson, *Curvature explosion in quotients and applications*, J. Diff. Geom. **85** (2010), 117–139.
13. P. Molino, *Riemannian foliations*, Progress in Mathematics **73**, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1988.
14. P. Molino, *Desingularisation Des Feuilletages Riemanniens* American Journal of Mathematics, **106** No 5,(1984) 1091-1106.
15. G. W. Schwarz, *Lifting smooth homotopies of orbit spaces*, Publicactions Mathématiques de L'I.H.É.S. **51** (1980), 37–135.
16. R. Strub. *Local classification of quotients of smooth manifolds by discontinuous groups*. Math. Z. **179** (1982) 43–57.
17. E. Swartz, *Matroids and quotients of spheres*, Math. Z. **241** (2002), no. 2, 247–269.
18. B. Wilking, *A duality theorem for Riemannian foliations in nonnegative sectional curvature*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **17**, (2007), no. 4, 1297-1320.

Marcos M. Alexandrino
Universidade de São Paulo, Instituto de Matemática e Estatística,
Rua do Matão 1010,05508 090 São Paulo, Brazil
E-mail address: `marcosmalex@yahoo.de, malex@ime.usp.br`

Marco Radeschi
Mathematisches Institut, WWU Münster, Einsteinstr. 62, Münster, Germany.
E-mail address: `mrade_02@uni-muenster.de`